



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

VB

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/336,328 06/18/99 BURNS

P S0351/186588

023370
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP
1100 PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 2800
ATLANTA GA 30309

HM22/0728

EXAMINER

MOEZIE, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED:


07/28/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademark

file

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/336,328	Applicant(s) Burns	
Examiner F. T. Moezie	Group Art Unit 1653	

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 18, 1999.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire one month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-26 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

FM

Art Unit: 1653

DETAILED ACTION

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-17, drawn to a composition comprising a GnRH or analogs, classified in class 530, subclass 328, for example.
- II. Claims 18-26, drawn to a method for treating reproductive disorders, classified in class 514, subclass 16, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product such as, clomiphene citrate to induce ovulation.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1653

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Moreover, the consideration of patentability is not the same for both inventions, i.e., a reference which might obviate claims drawn to one invention may not render obvious claims drawn to the other invention. Hence, it would be an undue burden to examine both inventions in one application.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

ELECTION OF SPECIES

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species as indicated below for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

In the event that Group I invention is elected applicant is required to elect; a species from:

a) GnRH, b) a specie of an analog or c) a specie of an agonist.

In the event that Group II invention is elected, applicant is *further* required to elect d) a specie of the disorder and e) a specie (subject) which is treated. Applicant is further required to elect an Ultimate specie for search purposes. An *Ultimate specie* is a specie wherein all of the variable parameters are accounted for.

Art Unit: 1653

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement ***must include*** an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and ***a listing of all claims readable thereon***, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Serial Number: 09/336,328

Page 5

Art Unit: 1653

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to F. T. Moezie at
telephone number (703) 305-4508. FAX: (703)305-4508

F. T. Moezie
F. T. MOEZIE, III
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT ¹⁰⁰1653